

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/970,582	10/04/2001		Leon H. Weyant	01062	1181
24386	7590	04/05/2004		EXAMINER	
ROBERT W PITTS				LEE, SEUNG H	
PO BOX 11483 WINSTON-SALEM, NC 27116-1483				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2876	

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Application No.	Applicant(s)						
09/970,582	WEYANT, LEON H.						
Examiner	Art Unit						
Seung H Lee	2876						
ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address						
oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	tion. A proper reply to a						
PLY [check either a) or b)]							
dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount that the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	IE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or						
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.							
ecause:							
er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);						
elow);							
n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the						
ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.						
ion(s):							
	eparate, timely filed amendment						
	dered but does NOT place the						
ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly						
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.							
nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)							
	Examiner Seung H Lee ars on the cover sheet with application and the sheet short sheet sheet short sheet shee						

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Kokubu (US 5,710,421), Crosley et al. (US 4,837,822), McCabe et al. (US 6,068,192), Ueda (US 4,849,617), Ohara et al. (US 5,739,814) still meet the claimed invention.

Continuation of 10. Other: Claims 1-39 remains as rejected as set forth in the Final Rejection (see paper NO. 20031227).

Additional Remarks: In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the configuration of the card itself is altered) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

For purposes of Appeal, the proposed response will be entered.